

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9                   AT SEATTLE

10                   COASTAL TRANSPORTATION,  
11                   INC.,

12                                 Plaintiff,

13                   v.

14                   EAST WEST SEAFOODS LLC,

15                                 Defendant.

16                   CASE NO. C17-1555JLR

17                   AMENDED ORDER GRANTING  
18                   MOTION TO VACATE ORDER  
19                   OF DEFAULT AND DENYING  
20                   RENEWED MOTION FOR  
21                   DEFAULT JUDGMENT

22                   I.       INTRODUCTION

23                   Before the court are: (1) Defendant East West Seafoods LLC’s (“EWS”) motion  
24                   to vacate the order of default entered against it (EWS Mot. (Dkt. # 24)); and (2) Plaintiff  
25                   Coastal Transportation, Inc.’s (“Coastal”) renewed motion for default judgment against  
26                   EWS (Coastal Mot. (Dkt. # 21)). The court has considered the motions, the materials  
27                   filed in support of and in opposition thereto, and the balance of the record. Being fully  
28                   //

1 advised,<sup>1</sup> the court GRANTS EWS's motion, ORDERS EWS's principal Chris Tsabouris  
2 to pay \$1,000.00 in sanctions to the court, and DENIES as moot Coastal's renewed  
3 motion for default judgment.

4 **II. BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS**

5 Coastal brings this action against EWS for an alleged failure to pay for freight  
6 services. (Compl. (Dkt. # 1) ¶¶ 4.1-4.5.) In its answer, EWS asserts various affirmative  
7 defenses and brings a counterclaim, alleging that Coastal wrongfully charged EWS's  
8 credit card without EWS's authorization. (*See* Ans. (Dkt. # 6) ¶¶ 6.1-6.4, 7.1-7.5.)

9 On January 17, 2018, EWS's former counsel, Harold Thoreen, filed a motion to  
10 withdraw. (Mot. to Withdraw (Dkt. # 8); *see* 1st Thoreen Decl. (Dkt. # 9) ¶¶ 3-4.) The  
11 court granted the motion on January 26, 2018. (1/26/18 Order (Dkt. # 11).) In its order,  
12 the court cautioned EWS that, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 83.2(b)(4), if EWS failed to  
13 obtain a replacement attorney within 30 days, the court would enter default against EWS.  
14 (*Id.* at 2); *see also* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 83.2(b)(4). Mr. Thoreen provided EWS  
15 with a copy of the court's order via email, certified mail, and fax. (2d Thoreen Decl.  
16 (Dkt. # 12) ¶¶ 1-3, Exs. 1-2 (attaching email and fax confirmation); 3rd Thoreen Decl.  
17 (Dkt. # 14) ¶ 1, Ex. 1 (attaching signed return receipt of certified mail).) No replacement  
18 attorney appeared on EWS's behalf in the 30 days. (*See* Dkt.) Thus, the court entered  
19 default against EWS and dismissed EWS's counterclaim against Coastal. (3/13/18 Order  
20 (Dkt. # 15) at 2-3.)

21  
22 

---

<sup>1</sup> Neither party requests oral argument, and the court finds that oral argument would not  
be helpful in its disposition of the motions. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(4).

1 After the court entered default against EWS, Coastal moved for default judgment.  
2 (See 1st Mot. for DJ (Dkt. # 17).) However, because Coastal did not provide sufficient  
3 supporting evidence with its motion, the court denied its motion without prejudice.  
4 (4/2/18 Order (Dkt. # 19) at 1-2.) After the court's denial, a replacement attorney  
5 appeared on EWS's behalf. (See Not. of Appear. (Dkt. # 20).)

6 The parties subsequently filed the two motions at issue. EWS, through its  
7 replacement attorney, filed a motion to vacate the order of default. (See EWS Mot.)  
8 Coastal filed a renewed motion for default judgment. (See Coastal Mot.) Coastal also  
9 filed an opposition to EWS's motion to vacate, arguing that EWS's culpable conduct led  
10 to the default. (See Resp. (Dkt. # 27.) at 1-3.)

11 EWS explains that it "has now retained counsel" and "understands that however it  
12 feels about the subject of the litigation, it must go through the process to an ultimate  
13 result." (EWS Mot. at 1.) EWS attaches the declaration of its principal, Mr. Tsabouris,  
14 in which Mr. Tsabouris explains that he "did not attend to this matter the way [he] should  
15 have" due to his travels to Alaska. (Tsabouris Decl. (Dkt. # 25) ¶ 3.) Mr. Tsabouris also  
16 stated that he "did not understand that it was necessary to go through this process"  
17 because he believed that EWS "had nothing to do with" the transaction at issue. (*Id.* ¶ 5.)  
18 Mr. Tsabouris further asserts that Mr. Thoreen "did not explain . . . that this process was  
19 necessary." (*Id.*) However, Mr. Tsabouris states that he has "now been lectured . . .  
20 regarding the necessity of participating in the litigation process" and am "prepared to go  
21 forward to a resolution of this matter on the merits." (*Id.*)

22 //

1       The order of default was predicated on EWS's lack of representation (*see* 3/13/18  
2 Order at 2-3), and because EWS has now obtained new counsel and demonstrated an  
3 understanding of the litigation process, the court finds good cause to set aside the order of  
4 default, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(c). Moreover, Coastal concedes that it cannot make a  
5 showing of prejudice and that EWS appears to articulate a meritorious defense. (Resp. at  
6 2); *see Johnson v. Wang*, No. C16-1738JLR, 2017 WL 1233101, at \*2 (W.D. Wash. Apr.  
7 4, 2017). Accordingly, the court vacates the order of default against EWS. Vacating the  
8 order of default necessarily renders Coastal's pending motion for default judgment moot,  
9 and the court denies it on that basis.

10       However, the court reprimands Mr. Tsabouris for failing to abide by the court's  
11 orders. Mr. Tsabouris's unilateral—and erroneous—decision that he "wanted to do  
12 nothing further with" this matter prompted Coastal and the court to take steps towards  
13 default judgment, which required time and resources that are wasted now that Mr.  
14 Tsabouris has newly discovered the importance of participating in litigation. (*See*  
15 Tsabouris Decl. ¶ 5.) Accordingly, Mr. Tsabouris must pay \$1,000.00 in sanctions to the  
16 court for failing to adhere to the court's orders and wasting judicial resources.

17       In this regard, Mr. Tsabouris cannot shift the blame to Mr. Thoreen. Mr. Thoreen  
18 filed numerous declarations documenting his various attempts to inform Mr. Tsabouris of  
19 the court's order and the consequences of not abiding. (*See, e.g.*, 2d Thoreen Decl.; 3rd  
20 Thoreen Decl.) Indeed, Mr. Thoreen specifically drew Mr. Tsabouris's attention to Local  
21 Civil Rule 83.2(b)(4), warning him that failure to obtain replacement counsel would  
22 result in default. (1st Thoreen Decl. ¶ 5; *see also* 2d Thoreen Decl. ¶ 1, Ex. 1 ("[I]f you

1 fail to have a replacement attorney appear on your behalf with in [sic] 30 days of the date  
2 of the Order . . . a default will be entered against [EWS].")). Thus, Mr. Tsabouris's  
3 conduct is not excused by Mr. Thoreen's conduct.

4 **III. CONCLUSION**

5 For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS EWS's motion to vacate (Dkt. # 24)  
6 and DENIES Coastal's renewed motion for default judgment (Dkt. # 21). The court  
7 ORDERS Mr. Tsabouris to pay \$1,000.00 as sanctions to the court no later than 30 days  
8 after the date of this order.

9 Dated this 24th day of April, 2018.

10  
11   
12

13 JAMES L. ROBART  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22